

**THE MINUTES OF THE 631ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 MARCH 2015
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Ralph DiPietro, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Thomas McDade, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Vernoca H. Michael
Eve Parrot, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects
Carl White, Think Brownstone
Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture
Dorothy Hamill, Esq., Sirlin Lesser & Benson
Stuart G. Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects
Massimiliano Scarchilli, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects
Laurie Sherman
Stephen Foley
Dave Schmauk, Wulff Architects
Christopher Massa, Girard Point Holdings
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq.
Harry K. Schwartz, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Derek Ziegler
Carol Ray
Jettie Newkirk, Esq.
Stacey Dowling
Carol Whitaker
Leslie Smallwood-Lewis, Mosaic Development
Guy Orens, Orens Brothers Development
Zenobia Harris, Office of Council President Darrell Clarke
The Rev. Louis E. Nash, Jr.

Sandra Norris
John DiSanto, phillyboxinghistory.com
Zac Pamilio
Robert Williams
Keith McMenamin

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, DiPietro, Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Mattioni, McDade, Merriman, Schaaf, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 630TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 630th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 February 2015. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 FEBRUARY 2015

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 123-29 S. 17th Street, 19 N. 03rd Street, and 940 E. Washington Lane. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 123-29 S. 17th Street, 19 N. 03rd Street, and 940 E. Washington Lane. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2023-25 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Remove garage; renovate building; construct addition and roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tisoped Corp.

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: 1885; George Hewitt, architect

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a carriage house, now a garage, into a multi-unit residential building. The front façade will be rehabilitated with the garage opening restored to its original arched opening. The entrance door opening will be cut down to grade and the door

extended with a kick plate. The structure behind will be completely reconfigured with the addition of several floors. At the rear, on Manning Street, the non-historic single-story cinderblock façade will be modified with new doors and windows that will be more in keeping with the character of the block. A fourth story will be added, which will be visible but setback from both Rittenhouse Square and Manning Streets. Two light wells will be cut into the structure to provide light to the residences. The details of the new windows and doors as well as the samples of the masonry repairs can be reviewed by the staff.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the design has been revised to comply with the suggestions of the Architectural Committee. The design of the hay loft doors has been revised to remove the glass, the design of the interior floors has been revised so that floors do not run across windows, and the design of the addition has been revised so that it will be inconspicuous from the street. A mock-up has demonstrated that the addition will be inconspicuous. Mr. Baron noted one other change to the design. A rooftop cupola will be restored and preserved.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the revisions address the concerns of the Architectural Committee. She noted that it is her understanding that the addition will not be visible from the street that runs in front of the property. Ms. Merriman and Mr. Sherman congratulated the applicants on the project.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 March 2015, provided the addition is not visible from the street, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 123-29 S 17TH ST

Project: Add and replace doors; install mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Liberti Center-City

Applicant: David Schmauk, Wulff Architects, Inc.

History: 1899; First Baptist Church; Edgar Seeler, architect

Individual Designation: 1/27/1962

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the Option B door design, provided a landing at the sidewalk is investigated, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to infill basement window wells and cut two window openings down to create doorways on the Sansom Street façade of this church building. The application offers two door designs for the new doorways. Either design is appropriate, but that the leaded glass windows removed from the openings to be enlarged should be salvaged and stored on site. The application proposes replacing the existing side door with a new door to match. The application also proposes adding mechanical equipment on the roof of the building. If feasible, a mock-up should be installed to allow the staff to determine the extent of visibility of the mechanical equipment.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1800 PINE ST, UNIT 103

Project: Replace windows and doors; repair masonry; construct decks, install vent

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Steven Carter & Laurie Sherman

Applicant: Matthew Fanfera, Samson Home Restoration

History: 1840

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitter Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the masonry repair, window and door replacement, and approval of the installation of a kitchen duct, provided the duct is flush with the façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9; and denial of the balcony brackets and the roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Rooftop Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make numerous modifications to a third and fourth-floor condominium unit of this four-story corner rowhouse. The application proposes to repoint masonry; to replace and restore portions of the existing cornice and historic entrance on the 18th Street façade; to restore a bathroom window on the third floor of a rear addition; to install simple steel brackets to provide additional support to a third floor balcony on the 18th Street façade; and to install an eight-inch copper kitchen duct on the 18th Street facade.

The application also proposes to install a large roof deck and trellis on the main block of the building, which would be accessed via a new exterior stairway from a proposed lower deck on top of the rear addition. The proposed roof deck would be set back six feet ten inches from the Pine Street façade, and two feet three inches from the 18th Street façade. The railing would span between the existing chimneys, which would be raised. The roof deck would feature a gas fireplace near the front of the building, and a black painted wood trellis and privacy screen along the west side of the deck.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Leonard Reuter, architect Stephen Foley, and owner Laurie Sherman represented the application.

Mr. Reuter clarified that the application did not propose to replace the windows, but rather to repair them and retain as much original wood and glass as possible. He noted that the owners accepted the denial of the balcony brackets, and that if, during construction, it was determined necessary structurally to support the balcony, they would file a separate application.

Mr. Reuter noted that the main issue was with the proposed roof deck, of which the Architectural Committee had recommended denial. He noted that, following the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant had revised the proposed deck substantially so that, although it was not invisible from the public right-of-way, it was no longer conspicuous. He stated that under the Standards and Guidelines, a rooftop addition “shall not be conspicuous from a public right-of-way.” He noted that Ms. DiPasquale reviewed a preliminary mock-up, at which time the architect and contractor had moved a small beam at the railing height to various positions on the roof

while Ms. DiPasquale, Mr. Reuter, and Ms. Sherman viewed the proposed positions from various vantage points on 18th and Pine Streets and provided guidance to limit visibility. The result of that mock-up was a deck reduced in size but still usable with limited visibility from the street. Mr. Reuter commented that the photographs submitted in the Commission packets showed the revised mock-up. He noted that white straps visible on the chimneys were not part of the proposed deck, but rather former antennae straps.

Mr. Reuter directed the Commission's attention to a photograph of the mock-up taken from Pine and Bouvier Streets, noting that it was location at which the mock-up was most visible. Mr. Reuter noted that the thin railing could be colored to minimize visibility. The front portion of the railing along Pine Street would not be readily visible, and the rear would have stairs from the rear ell, which would be camouflaged next to the railing of the Commission-approved neighboring deck. Since the Committee meeting, the applicant, Mr. Reuter noted, had narrowed the stairs to the Code-minimum three-feet in width, with a switchback, for a total width of six feet. The stairs would only be visible from a small area south on 18th Street, but would be somewhat obscured by a tree. The proposed stairs, Mr. Reuter continued, have a lower profile than the existing approved stairs on the neighboring property. As a result, the proposed stair would not cause any real change to the views or composition of the block. Ms. Merriman asked if the width of the stairs up to the deck had been reduced. Mr. Foley responded that the stair width had been narrowed by approximately one foot from seven feet in total to six feet.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the Architectural Committee had commented that the proposed lower deck, which in this proposal is being filled with access stairs, is perfectly adequate in size. In previous situations, she noted, such as that at 18th and Delancey, the Commission had determined that the deck on the main roof of the building must be invisible. She opined that she was not clear on how this situation was different than the one reviewed previously.

Mr. Reuter responded that he was the attorney for 1800 Delancey, and noted that, in that situation, a visible pilot house had been approved since it was thought to blend in with the pilot house of the neighboring property, in a similar way that in this proposal, the proposed stair would blend in with the neighboring deck stair and railing. He noted that he understood Ms. Hawkins' position, but countered that the Secretary of the Interior's guideline for rooftop additions makes the distinction between "conspicuous" and "inconspicuous," and requires that the addition not impact character-defining features. The character-defining features of the roof on this property, he opined, are the front roofline facing Pine Street and the side of the roofline with the chimneys. Mr. Reuter noted that the applicant is making a substantial investment in the renovations to the property, which, unlike other properties, has no other outdoor space. He commented that the "lower deck" is not currently a space for recreation or occupancy.

Ms. Hawkins asked if it was true that in order to provide access to the upper roof, the applicant had to create a safe access space with a railing, noted on the plans as "lower deck," which in itself would be enough space for a chair or barbeque. Mr. Foley responded that the proposed "lower deck" is currently a pitched roof that slopes to 18th Street. In order to create the lower deck, he noted, they propose to remove the roof and drop it down to the interior ceiling height. All of this work, he continued, would occur on the rear ell and below the existing parapet wall. Ms. Hawkins noted that the lower deck would be a 12'-6" by 13'-6" space on the roof of the building and could provide the desired outdoor space, but instead is being constructed merely to provide access to another outdoor space, the upper deck on the main roof. She stated that the lower deck should provide sufficient space; the upper deck is unnecessary.

Mr. Reuter claimed that the lower deck would not serve well as the only deck because it would be in shadow most of the day and would not provide an attractive view. Ms. Hawkins responded that the lower roof deck would be on the south and east corner, not in a deep shadow; it would receive sun all day. Mr. Reuter responded that the deck would be shaded by a street tree.

Mr. Sherman asked if Ms. Hawkins was objecting to the visibility of the deck railing. Ms. Hawkins responded that the issue is in part about the visibility of the railing, but also the premise, or assumption, that people can have a deck with the view that they want no matter what. The Commission, she continued, has historically encouraged decks to be located on rear ells, and this property has access to a rear ell for a deck of sufficient size. She opined that the size of the lower deck without the stair is reasonable. Two decks, she opined, are not appropriate, and based upon the information provided, she claimed that she could not locate the railing relative to 18th Street. Mr. Schaaf commented that the section drawing on page A-4 shows a parapet wall that extends up with a metal railing behind it.

Mr. Sherman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the upper deck and associated stair, but approve all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 5 to 6. Mses. Merriman and Turner and Messrs. Dilworth, DiPietro, Gupta, and McDade dissented.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 March 2015, provided no part of the railing of the upper deck is visible from 18th Street, with the staff to review details. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which by a vote of 6 to 4. Mses. Hawkins and Leonard and Messrs. Mattioni and Schaaf dissented.

ADDRESS: 1529 NORTH ST

Project: Construct single-family dwelling

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Linda C. Littlejohn & Apostolos Vardakis

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee commented that the front-loading garage is inappropriate, the street wall should be maintained with no recessed entry or front balcony, and that the cornice and masonry should turn the corner from the front façade onto the west wall.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story, single-family dwelling on a currently vacant lot. The property was identified in the Spring Garden Historic District inventory as a “garden with parking pad,” but given no classification. The Commission’s jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment only.

The front façade of the proposed townhouse would be clad in brick, with a cast-stone base and cast-stone lintel over a front-loading, carriage-style garage door. Above the garage door would

be a PVC-clad bay window with double-hung windows, and decorative brackets. The entry to the home would be located through a slightly recessed vestibule extending the full height of the building. A small balcony would be located at the third floor of this entrance bay.

The rear of the property, which is not visible to the public right-of-way, would be clad in stucco and feature a second-floor deck and a third-floor Juliette balcony. The proposed home would also feature a rooftop deck, accessed via a pilot house set back approximately eighteen feet from the front façade.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Chris Massa represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked whether the applicant needed to get a variance for the garage, and Mr. Massa responded that he will need a variance, but has not yet obtained one. Mr. Sherman contended that the garage is appropriate for this street, and Mr. Schaaf noted that the property is zoned RM1, and thus would need a variance for the garage, which is disallowed in Section 14-803 of the Philadelphia Code.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant was not present at the Architectural Committee, at which time the Committee commented that the recessed “slot” at the front entry is inconsistent with most Philadelphia housing types. Mr. Massa responded that other new construction in the area has similar recesses. He noted that regarding the garage, there are currently two parking spaces on the vacant lot, but the garage will only have one parking space. Mr. Schaaf responded that once the house is built, the current parking use on the lot will not be permitted.

Mr. Massa noted that owner of the adjoining vacant lot is proposing to construct a building as well, which is why this application does not propose to have the front façade turn the corner.

The Commission adopted the Architectural Committee’s recommendation without a formal motion.

ADDRESS: 111 S 15TH ST

Project: Replace awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chest-Pac Assoc LP

Applicant: Dottie Tuccio

History: 1922; Packard Building; Ritter & Shay, architects

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the awnings as presented, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace two awnings with smaller awnings in the southernmost two windows along the 15th Street façade. There are currently ten matching awnings along this façade, which were approved by the Commission in 2008, and replaced earlier awnings approved in 2005. The application proposes to reduce the height of the awnings by two panes of glass in height in order to increase visibility from the interior of the building in a new client space.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Carl White of Think Brownstone, the tenant, represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the concern at the Architectural Committee had been that the alteration of the two awnings to increase light and visibility in the individual tenant space would create inconsistency along the building façade, which is rigidly symmetrical about the central portal. The occupants of the other spaces in this part of the building are not willing to alter or remove the other awnings to correspond with the awnings in question. Removing the third awning on the south side of the entrance portal would at least maintain some consistency at this section of the building.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the Committee had discussed the option removing the awnings and installing signage in the windows. She asked Mr. White if he had explored that option. Mr. White responded that he had explored that possibility, but learned that the space where the signage would be installed is outside their leased area.

Ms. Merriman asked about the location of the entrance for the tenant space. Mr. White responded that the space is entered at the arched portal on 15th Street. Ms. Merriman asked whether a bronze plate for signage would be possible, and Mr. White responded that, since it was not part of their lease, the building owner/landlord would not permit signage anywhere but the awnings. The owner is unwilling to renegotiate the lease.

Mr. Sherman asked who is responsible for the existing awnings, and Mr. White responded that he believes that the property owner is responsible. Mr. Sherman asked if he had inquired whether the owner was willing to change all of the awnings. Mr. White responded that he had asked, and the owner was unwilling to do so. Mr. White noted that the awnings cost approximately \$1,500 each.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the Committee sought to preserve the consistent appearance of the aligned awnings across the entire façade of the building. Mr. Dilworth asked whether consistency was important in terms of preserving the historic character of the building. Ms. Hawkins responded that, in terms of signage, one could ask how the sign is damaging to the character of the building or block beyond the simple physical damage of the drilling of holes. Ms. Merriman noted that the Commission had strived for consistency with the Century 21 awnings on Market Street. Ms. Merriman noted that she did not feel comfortable approving a shorter awning at this location. She opined that it was up to the applicant to determine what was more important to them, light or signage. Mr. White responded that the face and bottom of the new awnings would remain the same as the other awnings, but they would not be as tall.

Mr. Schaaf asked whether the applicant could use a more transparent material for the awning that would allow light to infiltrate the space and would appear translucent from the interior, but solid from the exterior, and would retain the same size and shape as the other awnings on the building. Mr. Schaaf commented that there are many types of interior shades which allow views to the exterior but which block sun from entering, and appear opaque from the exterior. Ms. Hawkins commented that, if the goal is consistency, the appearance of the translucent fabric would need to be very similar to that of the existing awnings. Ms. Merriman noted that the shape is the most important aspect of the awnings.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the Commission allow either a translucent awning material on an awning structure that has a geometry that is consistent with the building's existing awnings, or the removal of the awnings altogether.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Mr. Dilworth dissented.

ADDRESS: 19 N 03RD ST

Project: Install windows, doors, storefront, and balconies; construct roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 19 North 3rd Street, LLC

Applicant: Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Kim.Broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefront, front and rear façade windows, and suggested rear balconies at the fourth and fifth floors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the roof deck and pilot house, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install new windows, doors, a storefront, and balconies on the front and rear façades of this mixed-use building located within the Old City Historic District. A roof deck and pilot house is proposed for the rear slope of the building. Since the time of the initial submission, the architect and property owner met with the staff of the Historical Commission and have subsequently revised their drawings to reflect comments from the staff. These revisions include the storefront and windows, to reflect an insurance survey from 1840 for this building; the removal of the balcony initially proposed for the front façade which was not appropriate for this building; and a pitched roof on the pilot house in an effort to minimize visibility from the street.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 940 E WASHINGTON LA

Project: Remove and replace chimney

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gili Ronen & Derek Ziegler

Applicant: Gili Ronen

History: 1914; Jean Smith House; Carl A. Ziegler, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, because the chimney is inconspicuous from public vantage points and, if detailed correctly, its replacement will not be discernable to the public.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a Wissahickon Schist chimney from this three-story Colonial Revival house to free up space for interior renovations and then replicate its exterior appearance above the roofline with a wood-framed structure clad with a Wissahickon Schist veneer. The house is located in the Awbury Arboretum Historic District. The chimney emerges through a rear slope of the roof. The chimney is minimally visible from the public right-of-way and public portions of the arboretum.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

OLD BUSINESS

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 12 NOVEMBER 2014

Richard Dilworth III, Chair

ADDRESS: 1314-16 N BROAD ST, BLUE HORIZON

Owner: Ray-Whitaker Inc.

Nominator: Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the exterior of the property at 1314-16 N. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the interior of the property at 1314-16 N. Broad Street does not satisfy the Criteria for Designation and should not be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Blue Horizon at 1314-16 N. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Blue Horizon is a culturally and architecturally significant building and that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. Originally constructed as three contiguous brownstone row houses around 1878, the properties were combined and converted into a fraternal hall by the Loyal Order of Moose in 1914, with a large auditorium addition designed by architect Carl Berger completed in 1916. In 1961, the property was renamed the Blue Horizon and hosted its first professional boxing match. The Blue Horizon closed in 2010 and has been vacant since.

A second nomination proposes to designate the Blue Horizon Auditorium as an historic interior and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the interior satisfies the definition of a public interior portion in the preservation ordinance and is historically significant. A “public interior portion” is defined as an interior space in a building or structure that is, or was designed to be, customarily open or accessible to the public, including by invitation” and has in no way “been significantly altered physically such that a substantial portion of the features reflecting design for public use no longer remain.” The auditorium served as Moose Lodge’s primary public interior space, served not only the organizational needs of the Moose organization, but was also regularly rented out for public gatherings such as sporting events, lectures, and conventions. Then in 1961, the auditorium was converted with minimal physical changes into the Blue Horizon boxing auditorium.

The equitable owners of the property have obtained a building permit to partially demolish the building including the auditorium, restore the front facades, and erect a hotel behind the facades. Owing to the fact that this permit application was submitted to the Department of Licenses & Inspections prior to the submission of the nominations and notification of the property by the Historical Commission of its consideration of the nominations, the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over the permit. The redevelopers may undertake the permitted work without the Historical Commission’s review or approval.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nominations to the Historical Commission. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nominations.

Mr. Leech stated that the Preservation Alliance submitted both of the nominations. He stated that he represents over 400 people, who have signed a petition to support the nominations of both the interior and exterior of the Blue Horizon. He stated that, at the time the nominations were written, the goal was to protect the building from demolition. He stated that they were unaware that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had approved a partial demolition and construction permit because the developer had not paid the permit fee or picked up the permit and therefore the permit was not issued nor posted on the Department’s website. He stated that the City has determined that the developer has a legal right to this permit without the Historical Commission’s review and the Alliance is not contesting that decision. He stated that nothing about this proposal is guaranteed. He stated that the sale to the developer has not closed and the financing for the project has not been secured. He stated that the Alliance concedes that the developer has the legal right to proceed under the permit, but, in the event that that work does not occur, a designation would allow the Commission to review future proposals for this building and prevent the entire building from being demolished for a parking lot.

Mr. Leech informed the Historical Commission that, five years ago under the Rendell Administration, the current hotel proposal was approved for a \$6 million subsidy through an RCAP grant. He stated that, at that time, this project was presented as a preservation project. He stated that the auditorium was proposed for adaptive reuse; it was not going to be demolished, but was going to be modified. At that time, the developer was seeking to list the property on the National Register and obtain historic preservation tax credits. He stated that the plans changed. He quoted the developer’s grant application: “Rendez-Blue will work with the City Planning Commission, the Historical Commission, and the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia to ensure that the historic property is preserved, revitalized and made available for public use.” He quoted another part of the grant application: “The City of Philadelphia Historical Commission will review the construction permits and determine if the existing structure includes

historic resources. If so, it will advise the Department of Licenses & Inspections of the design elements that must be preserved. Given the nature of the project, it is unlikely that any historical issues will be involved.”

Mr. Leech stated that the Alliance understands that plans change and they do not think that there is any reason to think that they will not change again. He stated that he wished that that the nominations were submitted to the Historical Commission five years ago. He stated that the nominations are under review today and the building is still standing. He stated that the nominations clearly demonstrate why the Blue Horizon and the auditorium are historic and why they merit listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He stated that they support the staff's opinion that they meet the Criteria for Designation. He stated that they respectfully disagree with the Committee on Historic Designation recommendation against designation of the auditorium based on the fact that it was a tolled or ticketed area not publicly owned and not publicly accessible from the public right-of-way. He stated that these are not requirements of the historic preservation ordinance. He stated that, if the intent of the ordinance was to limit interior designations to spaces owned by the public and non-profit institutions, then it would have been stated as such. He stated that the ordinance specifically allows for designations of spaces like the Blue Horizon auditorium, the Academy of Music, and the Boyd Theater, spaces that were public even by invitation. He stated that the Blue Horizon has been a Broad Street and Philadelphia icon for more than 100 years. He stated that the auditorium appears virtually unchanged from the day it opened almost 100 years ago. He stated that its significance to the history of boxing is unquestionable. He stated that it has a deep history; three, four, or five layers of history that are included in the nominations. He stated that the property clearly meets Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

Harry K. Schwartz of Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that interior designation is a relatively new provision in the historic preservation ordinance. He stated that it has only been used twice to date. He stated that an acceptance of the Committee's recommendation would create a precedent; this interpretation of the language in the ordinance would inevitably establish a guideline for the Commission's subsequent decisions on interiors. He stated that the Alliance is concerned about the discussion that took place during the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. He referred to the minutes of that meeting and stated that the chair of the Committee on Historic Designation explained that inherent in the Criteria for Designation is an assertion that significance is tied to the public good and at another point the chair stated that he is of the opinion that the Commission should only designate interiors that are either publicly owned or owned by non-profit organizations. Mr. Schwartz stated that there is nothing in the language in the ordinance that permits such an interpretation. He stated that the ordinance intended clearly to define eligible interiors more broadly. He pointed to the definition of “interior” in the ordinance, which states that interior portions of a building that were designed to be and are still used exclusively as one or more private residences are ineligible. He stated that other interiors like the Blue Horizon auditorium are eligible.

Mr. Schwartz stated that, if City Council had intended to apply a public interest test for designation eligibility, it could easily have done so because the question of public interest is expressly addressed in the demolition provisions. That section is designed to allow the approval of the demolition of a designated building if one is able to demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. He stated that the public interest question should only be asked during demolition reviews, not during designation reviews. He opined that adopting the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation would significantly alter the meaning

of the provision related to interiors in an adverse way and the Alliance strongly urges the Commission not to do that.

Mr. Dilworth stated that he thought the minutes were somewhat inaccurate, which may have led to Mr. Schwartz's misinterpretation. He clarified that he did not say that interior designation should only apply to publicly owned and non-profit owned buildings. He stated that he said that for this interior space has always been a space for which one could enter only by paying a fee; it was treated as a private commodity. He stated that that is not true of all privately owned spaces. He stated that a hotel lobby and a shopping mall are an examples of a privately owned interior space for which one does not have to pay a fee to enter.

Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee on Historic Designation meeting minute be amended. He asked Mr. Dilworth to forward his comments on the minutes to him. He informed the Commission that the minute remains a draft and will be revised to accurately reflect the statements that the chair made during the meeting. He stated that he did not think that Mr. Dilworth ever advocated for or indicated that the Commission's power to designate interior spaces was precluded from designating spaces that were privately owned or that were tolled spaces. He stated that he raised the point during the Committee on Historic Committee meeting that, when the ordinance was being amended to include the interior authority, the Law Department advised that "by invitation" could include places like movie theaters and restaurants, places where one paid a fee to enter. Mr. Farnham explained that Mr. Dilworth was not making a legal distinction, but was instead making a policy distinction. He stated that Mr. Dilworth did not question the Commission's authority to designate tolled spaces, but was questioning whether it was prudent to exercise that authority and designate tolled spaces.

Mr. Farnham informed the Commission that the redevelopers hold a valid building permit to demolish the auditorium and build a hotel addition that is not subject to the review of this Commission. He stated that the hotel project that would allow for the retention of the brownstones facing Broad Street and the main blocks, but would remove significant portions of the rear of the building. He stated that that permit was applied for in September of 2013 and issued in 2015. He stated that he has had extensive conversations with the Law Department and the Department of Licenses & Inspections and it is the City's position that the permit was issued validly and legally. He stated that the developers can legally undertake the work defined in that permit and significantly alter the building without the intervention of this Commission.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham to provide a detailed accounting of the work permitted. Mr. Farnham replied that, since the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the work, he has not seen the construction drawings for the project. He stated that he understood the work to include the demolition of the auditorium section and rear portions of the building and the construction of new structures beside and around the brownstones for a hotel facility.

Mr. Gupta asked what impact the designation of the interior has on the permit. Mr. Farnham stated that it would have no impact on the permit. He informed the Commission that, as long as the permit remains valid, the developer can perform work under that permit without the Historical Commission's intervention. He stated that the auditorium could be lost and, if designated, then that designation would be meaningless.

Mr. Gupta stated that he has a hard time imagining an adaptive reuse for the space that does not impact its historic nature. Mr. Leech stated that the Alliance is under no illusion that the use of the space must change from its former use. He stated that the designation of the space would

allow for claims that the space could not be adaptively reused to be reviewed in the hardship arena. Mr. Schwartz stated that the permit does not guarantee that the auditorium will be lost. He stated that there is an agreement between the owners, developers, and the Alliance that ensures that the demolition will not commence before the financing is secured.

Ms. Leonard asked how long the permit will remain valid and whether it can be renewed. Mr. DiPietro stated that, as long as they conduct work under the permit, it remains valid. He stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections will review the permit after six months, but that review period can last up to one year. He stated that a permit holder can request that the Commonwealth restore the permit for up to five years.

Mr. Dilworth stated he was not commenting on the legal meaning of the ordinance, but was providing an opinion during the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. He stated that the Commission is not mandated to designate an interior space, so each nomination for an interior space will be reviewed on its own merits. Mr. Dilworth stated that he votes whether to designate or not based on whether the designation would provide some form of a public good. He stated that that good is based on what kind of good it was in the first place and in this case it was a private good, a private commodity. He stated that it is an interior space that was only open to persons who paid a fee to access it. The space was private. He stated the Committee discussed the historic nature of this space and there was a question of whether or not this space would be considered at all were it not a boxing venue. He stated that the only artifact related to its time as a boxing venue is the boxing ring, which is not a permanent part of the space. He stated that it is an object standing in the middle of the room. He stated that, without the boxing ring, it is the Moose Lodge auditorium.

Vernoca H. Michael, a co-owner of the property, stated that the materials and discussions that the Commission has considered suggests that the Legendary Blue Horizon has been nothing but a boxing venue since the 1960s. She informed the Commission that that is untrue. She stated that, during its years hosting boxing events, it held only 6 to 15 days of boxing annually. She stated that everyone knows the photograph of the ring; however, the ring went up the day before fight and came down after the fight. She stated that the building was used for many purposes including parties, weddings, receptions, cabarets, concerts, services, et cetera. Boxing was a very small part of the history of the building, but it has been romanticized. She stated that the building served as a church for a number of years. She stated that she ran a learning center at the building. She opined that the most significant events at the Blue Horizon were related to education, but the media was uninterested in that.

Ms. Michael pointed to a photograph of the auditorium and stated that the room looks nothing like that today because of the deterioration that has occurred. She stated that the room today cannot be used for anything. She stated that she is sad about its condition, but she was unable to prevent it. She stated that the interior and exterior of the building are in poor condition. She informed the Commission that there are two very large spaces under the auditorium, both of which need major repairs. She asked the Commission to reflect on the reality of the condition of the auditorium and the building.

Dorothy Hamill, Esq., an attorney representing the owners and developers, stated that it is misleading for the Alliance to say that they were not aware of the demolition as they were copied on emails in 2013, when the owners and developers were in discussions with the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission about the revisions to the project. She stated that they have a preservation agreement with the Historical & Museum Commission, which

includes money for the City's Parks & Recreation Department to survey its historic resources. Ms. Hamill stated that the state subsidy did not require preservation. She stated that, with respect to the change of plans from preservation to demolition, the changes were not made lightly. She stated that the developers are a minority group that know the neighborhood and are from the neighborhood and are invested in this project. She stated that they explored many options and spoke to many parties about reusing the building, from famous boxers to big-time promotion agents to people within the City, to Temple, from the top down. She stated that nobody wanted anything to do with the building. She stated that, in regard to the petition, the majority of the petitioners do not live in the neighborhood or even in the city. She stated that she has 1,500 signatures of people supporting the project, which were collected in the neighborhood, from the people who live there and will be impacted by this project. She stated that their position is that, although historic preservation is important, it is not warranted in this case. She confirmed that they entered into an agreement with the Alliance. She stated that they will be undertaking environmental remediation under the permit before they meet the financing conditions in the agreement. She stated that they will be working on remediation during this time while they secure their financing.

Ms. Hamill stated that the nominations do not make cases for designation. She stated that the architect Carl Berger did not design the mansions. She stated that the designer of the mansions is not identified. She stated that they are Second Empire in architectural style, which is not an endangered architectural style. She stated that there are significant examples of it in the city, such as City Hall and the Union League and many other brownstones scattered throughout the city. She stated that all of the windows have been replaced, as well as the railings. She stated that the façade was deteriorating and has been coated. She distributed photographs showing the condition of the building and stated that the property has been shut down for five years. She stated that the chimneys are unstable and there are problems structurally. She stated that part of the reason why boxing matches are no longer held at the building is because the building was continually cited by the Department of Licenses & Inspections for violations. She stated the building could not be sustained and there was not enough money to make the necessary repairs and bring it into compliance.

Ms. Hamill stated that the residents of the mansions were not significant persons. She opined that the only one who had any significance was Moses Dropsie; however, this was not the site of Dropsie College, which merged with University of Pennsylvania. She stated that everything related to Dropsie's significance, such as his book collections and college, are now part of University of Pennsylvania and do not exist at this site. She stated that Moose Lodge did not leave any significant impact on the City. She stated that they left the building in 1960. She stated that the auditorium was designed by Carl Berger, a Moose member and the treasurer. She stated that nothing significant occurred there under the Moose Lodge ownership and it did not leave any lasting impression on the City.

Ms. Hamill stated that there is much about the history of boxing in the nomination, but most of it has nothing to do with and predates the Blue Horizon. She stated that Blue Horizon did not host boxing until 1961 and it is not the longest running boxing venue in the city. She stated that, of the 45 years it was operating, they had 25 years when there were five matches or fewer, which meant that it was being used as a boxing venue only five days a year. She stated that it had one national title bout in its time as a boxing arena. There are other boxing venues in the city that have hosted many more fights and fights of greater significance. She stated that the most significant fights in the City of Philadelphia occurred at the Spectrum. She stated that the Cambria Club operated longer and that was the club that significantly contributed to the sport of

boxing in the City of Philadelphia. She stated that boxing did not really get going at the Blue until the 1970s, which was when boxing started on the decline. She stated the USA Friday Night Fights were held there for a short period of time. Some of the original lighting was removed for the broadcasts. She stated that the quote in the nomination that "Philadelphia was the universe of boxing" dates to 1911, 50 years before a fight was held at the Blue Horizon. The boxing history in the nomination is entirely unrelated to this building and should be ignored. She stated the boxing started at the Blue in 1961 and ended in 2010. She stated that the vast majority of events that occurred at the Blue had nothing to do with boxing. She stated that the education that occurred there has more significance to the neighborhood. She contended that this building may hold historic significance for some, but they are not members of the community in which this building stands. Outsiders are seeking to impose their notion of significance on this community.

Ms. Hamill stated that the redevelopment project will incorporate the history of the building into the hotel. She stated that they intend to preserve the mural on the side of the building.

Ms. Michael stated that she used a period photograph to restore the front façade of the building. She stated that she replicated the railings, installed the marquee to match the original, and installed new windows and doors to match the ones shown in the photograph.

Leslie Smallwood-Lewis, one of the developers, stated that her team considered all possible adaptive reuses for the building in its current state. She stated that they spoke to Comcast-Spectacor, Temple University, Union Transfer, The House of Blues, restaurant owners, and others. She stated that, because of the current configuration, it is not possible to reuse auditorium because it does not seat enough people to be viable for any kind of entertainment use. She stated that a minimum of 3,200 seats is needed for it to be viable and this space can only seat a maximum of 1,300 with folding chairs. She stated that that, in itself, confounds adaptively reusing the space. She informed the Commission that the two levels below, which are as massive as the auditorium, but have no windows, are not conducive for reuse. She stated that it is another hindrance for adaptive reuse. She stressed that they wanted to reuse this space, but it was impossible. She stated that, when they submitted for the state subsidy, it was clearly in the design that that space would be completely gutted and remodeled into hotel rooms. She stated that they are endeavoring to be respectful of the history. They specifically looked for a hotel brand that was willing to embrace the history of the building and the flavor of N. Broad Street and elected to go with Hotel Indigo because it provides for that level of flexibility in its design. She mentioned that they had multiple conversations with the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission along with the Preservation Alliance. She stated that they came to an agreement with the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission regarding the RCAP grant, which was agreed to by the Philadelphia Department of Parks & Recreation. Owing to that agreement, they believed that the City of Philadelphia supported the project. She stated that they were broadsided by the Preservation Alliance's submission of the nominations.

Ms. Smallwood-Lewis stated that they are not opposed to maintaining the façade on Broad Street, which is part of their plan. She stated that the designation of the interior space would adversely impact the project. She stated that designation would confound the project as it raised concerns for the lenders. She stated that, in honor of the building's tradition of education, they have entered into an agreement with Temple University's hospitality program to use the hotel as a learning laboratory. She stated that they have tried to respect the history of this building, but it is clear through all of their investigations that maintaining the interior space does not work.

Ms. Michael stated that the developers are the only ones who offered to preserve the building. She stated that others wanted to buy it and demolish the entire building. She stated that maintaining the building as proposed by the project is very important to her.

Mr. Mattioni asked the owners and developers to clarify that they do not object to the designation of the front façade, but that they do object to the designation of the interior. Ms. Michael affirmed. Mr. Mattioni also asked them to clarify that they are suggesting with respect to the interior that the architecture itself has no real significance and that they contest the historical significance because the only aspect of the history considered in the nomination is its history as a boxing venue, which was a minor part of the building's use. Ms. Michael agreed with his statement. Mr. Mattioni stated that the owner's objection to the designation of the interior appears not to be related to public accessibility but to its significance as defined in the nomination.

Zenobia Harris of the Office of Council President Darrell Clarke stated that the owners and developers held numerous community meetings about this project in 2013. She stated that she understood that there has been no activity there for many years. She stated that everyone appreciates that it has historic value, but right now it has no value to the community. She stated that her office is in complete support of the project. She stated that they would appreciate the façade being maintained, but asserted that the hotel project should move forward.

Stacey Dowling, the owner of the adjacent property and a partner in the project, stated that he owned the property for 20 years and can speak on behalf of the community. He stated that the community is in support of this project. He stated that the building is blighted and the community is in support of the hotel project moving forward.

The Rev. Louis E. Nash, Sr., who is involved in redevelopment in the neighborhood, stated that he fully supports this project. He stated that he also represents the 47th Ward as a Committee person. The ward leader has met with the stakeholders several times and the ward supports the project, which will create jobs. He stated that the building has been blighted and is an eyesore. He stated that any delays will result in higher costs and lost money for the developers. He stated that this project will improve the community. He urged the Commission to approve the project.

Sandra Norris, executive director of New Freedom Theatre, which is located in the Edwin Forest mansion on the corner of Broad and Master Streets, stated that she is concerned about the impact of this project on her National Historic Landmark building. She stated that they were never invited to any meetings. She asked how her building would be protected. She stated that they are not opposed to the hotel, but she is concerned with the protection of her building. Ms. Merriman suggested that Mr. Farnham could meet with Ms. Norris outside of this venue and could any questions she might have, which are unrelated to the nominations under review.

John DiSanto, the founder and editor of phillyboxinghistory.com, stated that the Blue Horizon was the best boxing venue in Philadelphia and it is important. He stated that the Blue Horizon is historically significant because of the events that occurred there, the men and women who fought there, the fans that witnessed those fights, and the place that boxing holds in Philadelphia's history. He stated that it is important to remember the Blue Horizon. He stated that more important venues have been lost, but the Blue Horizon survives. He acknowledged that a hotel that retains the front of the Blue Horizon is worth something. He stated that the auditorium is unique and the thought of losing it is heartbreaking.

Zac Pamilio, a boxing promoter, stated that he has promoted fights at the Blue Horizon. He stated that the boxing community views this as the Number One boxing venue in the world. He opined that it makes no sense to have a Historical Commission if the Number One venue ever is demolished. He asserted that the interior is more significant than the exterior. He stated that the city is full of brownstones, but only has one Blue Horizon. He stated that what is most significant is the balcony in the auditorium; it allowed spectators to be close up to the fights. He suggested that, if it cannot be a venue, it should be a museum. He stated that demolishing the auditorium is akin to demolishing the Green Monster at Fenway Park, but retaining the exterior of the stadium. He stated that, although there was only one world title fight fought in the Blue Horizon, there were at least 30 to 40 national title fights fought there.

Robert Williams stated that he grew up in the community. He stated that the Civic Center and the Spectrum are gone because time moves on. He stated that this project could bring more value and life to the property and the community, which is crying out for this project to move forward.

Keith McMenamin stated that he grew up near this community. He stated that the Blue Horizon is a world-renowned boxing venue. He stated that he believes in the history of this building.

The Rev. Nash informed the Commission that his father passed away earlier this week and he will be holding the funeral after this meeting. He stated that he took time out of this busy and emotional week to attend this meeting and support this project because it means that much to him and the community that it move forward. Ms. Merriman gave her condolences.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham to read Criteria for Designation A, C, and J to the Commission, which he did. Mr. Dilworth informed the Commission that during the Committee on Historic Designation meeting the owners expressed concern about the designation of the entire exterior. He stated that they requested that the Commission consider designating the front façade only and they noted the agreement with the Preservation Alliance to restore the front facade. He stated that the Committee recommended that the exterior of the property satisfies the Criteria for Designation, but did not opine on whether it should be designated. He stated that he supports the designation of the exterior.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to find that the exterior of the property at 1314-16 N. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, to designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the stipulation that the Historical Commission will only regulate the front or Broad Street facades of the historic brownstone mansions. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Mr. Schaaf dissented.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation finding that the interior of the property at 1314-16 N. Broad Street does not satisfy the Criteria for Designation and to reject the nomination to designate the interior as historic. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 11:26 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.